Meeting called to order by Commissioner Kolhage at 2:00 PM.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members in Attendance:

Commissioner Danny Kolhage

Kay Miller

Robert Padron

Sonny Knowles

Marlene Durazo

Dr Julie Ann Floyd

Harvey Wolney

Staff and Guests in Attendance:

Peter Horton, KWIA.

Deborah Lagos, URS Corp.

Dan Botto, URS Corp.

Matt Herum

R. L. Blazevic, Resident

Robert Gold, Resident

Brent Robbins, Resident

Stewart Andrews, Resident

Brendan Cunningham, City of Key West

A quorum was present.

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes for the February 5th and April 2nd, 2013 Ad Hoc Committee Meetings

Commissioner Kolhage asked if there were any comments on the meeting minutes for either the February or April meetings. No comments were volunteered. Kay Miller motioned for approval and Marlene Durazo seconded the motion. There were no objections and the motion carried.

Discussion of Part 150 Study Update

Role of the FAA and the Part 150 Process

Dan Botto discussed the role of the FAA in the Part 150 Study and process. A handout describing this role and the process was provided to the Committee at the behest of the FAA, and will be provided at each meeting. The Committee was reminded that the FAA does not automatically approve all recommended measures of the Part 150 Study.

Dan explained that the FAA also does not approve the NEMs, they strictly determine if the NEMs are in compliance with the Part 150 requirements, and will issue a Notice of Compliance in the Federal Register. They will make sure that URS and the Airport are following the rules and regulations that govern the Part 150 Process and that the public was included; additionally, they will provide guidance and instruction as to items that were not covered or covered improperly.

Dan further mentioned that the approval role of the FAA occurs during the Noise Compatibility Program [NCP] where recommendations are made for operational and/or land use mitigation measures, like the NIP. That is where the FAA will approve or disprove each recommendation based on the Part 150 requirements.

Dan continued that we are currently in the NCP process and will be discussing items for recommendation in today's meeting. Deborah Lagos mentioned that the handout provided at every meeting lists the criteria or filter that the FAA uses when reviewing the recommended mitigation measures. Deborah further explained that the goal is to make recommendations that will be approved by the FAA.

Robert Gold asked if there is an opportunity for public comment on this document. Peter Horton explained that the NCP has been placed on the agenda for the July Monroe County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) monthly meeting as a Public Hearing. Dan explained further that today's meeting is also a place for public comments.

Noise Compatibility Program

Deborah Lagos explained that the NCP contains information that had previously been discussed in the Ad Hoc meetings and the NCP was attempting to document those recommendations. Furthermore, if the recommendations do not clearly

present the ideas of this committee, please provide your comments here and any item will be revised.

Operational Alternatives:

Deborah began by discussing the first section, "Consideration of Operational Alternatives." The previous meetings provided many good ideas, and we put those ideas into the proper format for the NCP. Also, there are items included that are required and if we are not recommending them, the documentation must describe why they are not being recommended.

Dan Botto began the discussion of specific items covered in the Operational Alternatives section.

<u>Barriers and Acoustic Shielding:</u> Dan Botto mentioned that a previous study to determine the applicability of noise barrier at Key West had determined that the distance between the noise producer and noise receptor is too great for the barrier to have any noticeable effect. The NCP is not recommending this alternative.

<u>Ground Power Units:</u> Dan Botto indicated that this was discussed at previous meetings. No definitive research shows the use of GPUs reduce noise, but as the noise source is positioned lower to the ground than the onboard power unit, it may result in less annoyance. Furthermore, there is a reduction in air quality emissions. The voluntary use of GPUs is recommended, when time and safety permits.

<u>Aircraft Run-up Location:</u> Dan Botto explained that there is currently mandatory use between 11 pm and 7 am, and voluntary for the rest of the day. The NCP recommends that this policy remain in place, with the addition of improved education of airport users, including lighted signs on the runway, handouts and Jeppeson inserts. Kay Miller asked if this if primarily for the GA pilots. Dan responded by mentioning a conversation with the Delta station chief where she said that the pilots are constantly being rotated on and off the Key West flights and may not be aware of current noise abatement procedures. Deborah Lagos mentioned that this is more applicable to GA than commercial since most commercial aircraft do not require a preflight warm-up.

Runway Utilization: Dan Botto said that with a single runway system, runway utilization is based on prevailing winds and KWIA is oriented so that prevailing winds produce the most favorable utilization regarding aircraft noise. Aircraft primarily arrive and depart from Runway 09, with quieter arrival operations occurring from the west over the island and louder departure operations occurring

to the east over water. Furthermore, any utilization change would be minimal as wind dictates flight direction.

Robert Gold questioned the statement at the top of page 8-5 in the NCP discussing that the increased use of Runway 27 would increase the amount of noncompatible land use, therefore there is no benefit of shifting operations to Runway 27. Mr. Gold stated that this was a hasty and not quantified conclusion. Robert says he understands that there are areas that would receive greater impact but there are larger areas that would have reduced impacts. The language implies that there would be no net change. Robert continued that he does not believe this to be true, and that similar logic is used in the Alternate Approach in Section 8-4. Robert also said he would register the strongest disagreement with the logic being used. Robert's interpretation is that if anyone would receive a higher noise level due to a change, this is a rational for ruling out the use of the alternative, but he feels there is significant opportunity to "spread the pain" in a way that would reduce noise levels for more than would receive higher noise levels.

Dr. Julia Ann Floyd believes that the use of noise levels as a reason to not recommend a change in runway use does not even need to be included in the document because runway use is so dictated by wind conditions that changing runway utilization is not a viable option. Robert Gold suggests that with no statistics to backup that information, operations should land on Runway 27 whenever wind permits. Sonny Knowles explained that the only time this would be an option would be when wind is below 5 knots, and this would result in departures from 27 creating more noise over the island because the ATCT would not be able to operate flights head to head (arrive 27 and depart 09). Dr. Floyd mentioned that calm winds occur very infrequently at KWIA, and when the winds do resume the airport would have to be reconfigured (operationally) to handle into the wind operations, which would most likely result in using Runway 09. Robert Gold stated that his objection is that the language used in the NCP implies that if any person experiences more noise as the result of an alternative, then the alternative is rejected. He objects to the logic of that statement.

Deborah Lagos explained the FAA is going to look at the DNL 65 dB (and above) contour and that is their criteria to determine if an alternative is improving the situation or not, then there is everything outside the 65. There could be changes that show no positive change within the 65 but have changes outside the 65. Unfortunately the FAA does not consider those areas in their decision making. For any type of operational measure that is recommended for approval, we have to show that there is either a reduction in the size of the 65 contour or the shape shifts so there are less people included in the 65 contour. Deborah continued that

we can rewrite the recommendation so that it does not imply that there couldn't be a benefit, but unfortunately any modeled scenario would show an increase in size or number of impacted people if we increased departures off Runway 27. Departures are louder than arrivals and reversing the flow will immediately cause the contour to enlarge along the departure path.

Mr. Gold reiterates that it is the logic not the strategy of the Runway 27 usage that he objects to. Kay Miller asked what is the solution. Commissioner Kolhage asked what difference does it make if it doesn't change the conclusion. Sonny Knowles interjected that he feels the entire 8-3 section was intended for airports with multiple runways and was not designed for airports with a single runway. Deborah Lagos indicated that the text will be changed to indicate that for a single runway airport, this is not really a viable or appropriate option. Commissioner Kolhage asked if the change will still come to the same conclusion. Deborah Lagos said that the change will be along the lines of "because this is a single runway airport, it is not practical to implement a preferential runway use." Peter Horton continued that this is not a viable option especially when you consider KWIA has concentric airspace with NAS Key West. Dan Botto mentioned that the previous paragraph discusses the other mitigating factors such as wind conditions and interactions with NASKW. Peter Horton also indicated that the 737 and larger aircraft find it safer to arrive to 09 with the 3 mile stabilized approach instead of landing to 27 with possible conflicts with US Navy aircraft. Sonny Knowles mentioned that even if the flights come in east of the Navy there would still be airspace conflicts. Peter Horton said from an operational side, he would not want to see Runway 27 as the preferred arrival runway.

Kay Miller asked Mr. Gold if he accepts these changes. Mr. Gold agreed and said that the text as it stands does not prove the conclusion that current runway utilization "generates the least noise impact."

<u>Intersection Departures</u>: Dan Botto discussed that one of the items from the previous meeting was for smaller aircraft to use the taxiway C intersection for departures. The NCP recommends that smaller aircraft, when weather and safety permit, use the taxiway C intersection, instead of the Runway 09 end, for departures. This change would move single noise events caused by the smaller aircraft approximately 1,000 feet to the east, away from the residential areas off the end of Runway 09. Sonny Knowles indicated that there are currently some aircraft, including one of the island tour biplanes, that use this when possible, which does keep noise away from the residential areas. Dr. Floyd mentioned that one of the first thing you learn when flying is to use all the available runway in case there is a mechanical problem. If you were to lose an engine, you would much

rather have flat runway in front of you instead of water or a salt pond. The pilots look at what is more safe versus less safe, and the pilots would not like to operate if they had to use the taxiway C intersection departure. Dan Botto pointed out that this would strictly be a voluntary procedure. Sonny Knowles said it is definitely more safe to use the whole runway, but it is sometimes more convenient to use the taxiway C intersection.

Modification of Flight Tracks: Dan Botto explained that Section 8-4 discusses the ability to modify flight tracks and then provides figures indicating that currently aircraft do not follow any single flight track into KWIA. Commercial aircraft and jet aircraft prefer to use a 3 mile final, but other aircraft fly the most convenient route, weather, traffic, aircraft handling, and pilot skill permitting. Sonny Knowles indicates that many times the pilot wants to make a short approach to save time and/or fuel and the tower will extend your base leg due to traffic.

Robert Gold mentioned the text on page 8-7, "previously KWIA instituted an alternative voluntary approach from the north for smaller aircraft." continued that the language used in the text does not quantify the level of impact caused by the implementation of the Garrison Bight Approach. quantification of the noise complaints then increasing from 1 to 10 complaints could be viewed as the same as increasing from 10 to 100 complaints. The way the language is, any increase in complaints results in the alternative being discounted. Mr. Gold feels that there is a false equation being presented here. believes that there are far fewer homes under the Garrison Bight Approach than under the scenic straight-in approach, and while he does understand that commercial and jet traffic will use the 3 mile final, he is advocating that there are voluntary procedures for the smaller aircraft to mix up the approach paths. Mr. Gold also believes that the figures indicating flight tracks do not relay any useful information and is misleading since most aircraft still use the straight in approach. Robert believes that the information provided does not sufficiently close the issue of alternate approach paths. Dan Botto mentioned that during the analysis of the Garrison Bight Approach; there was a noticeable bulge in the contour along the GB approach path, with the corresponding increase in noncompatible land use. When the suggested use of the GB approach was rescinded, the contour was reduced thereby indicating that the random dispersion already in place resulted in fewer noncompatible land uses then the voluntary use of the GB Approach. Dan continued that due to the density of residential land uses around KWIA, there are not any viable options to direct aircraft flights that will not result in an increase in impacted noncomaptible land.

Robert Gold remarked that he believes the DNL 65 dB noise contour skews the results with respect to the number of homes affected. There certainly will be people under the GB Approach that will experience a higher noise level, but the trade-off will be an equal reduction in noise over a lot more homes on the straight in approach.

Robert Gold continued that he believes that the way in which this has been modeled obscures a more careful analysis and the language precludes voluntary guidelines for noncommercial VFR traffic to mix up their flight paths. Robert feels that the language in the NCP closes the discussion.

Peter Horton commented that the figures of the arrival radar tracks show many aircraft still use the GB Approach, but the tracks also show many aircraft follow the VOR to Fleming Key and then make a left turn to the runway. The departure flight track figure also show many aircraft depart over Garrison Bight, usually in response to direction from the Tower.

Peter continued that, based on his history at KWIA, Mr. Gold's assumption is flawed if he thinks the citizens of Key West will be willing to share the pain. He has yet to have someone approach him and ask to have aircraft fly over their home to relieve others of some of the noise. Mr. Gold responded that the roll of government is to impose burdens on society when society is unwilling to impose those burdens themselves.

Robert continued saying he believes the straight-in approach covers the greatest number of homes of any possible flight track into KWIA. Peter Horton agreed with him. Mr. Gold also wanted to augment his comments to include the business jets and the air tour biplanes to limit the flights of both of these types over Old Town.

Commissioner Kolhage asked where are the noise complaints primarily emanating from. Dan Botto responded that recently there are very few noise complaints, but they tend to be clustered from Linda Avenue, Key West by the Sea, and the areas directly off the end of the runway. Deborah Lagos mentioned the areas between Fourth and Harris, and Stewart Andrews indicated that he has called from his home on Staples Avenue.

Mr. Gold asked if there is any discussion in the NCP of the corporate jets or the air tour biplanes, as these are both louder than the 737's. Dan Botto mentioned that in a later section there is a discussion regarding the phasing out of the older noise stage 1 and 2 corporate jets. Sonny Knowles indicated that the air tours don't fly the straight in approach. They circle the island and then try to get onto

the ground as quickly as possible to pick up the next tour. If they are on the straight-in approach, it is at the request of the Tower.

Robert Gold then asked if there was any way to help document the noise from the biplanes because it doesn't seem like they are just passing over, but they are actually circling his neighborhood. Marlene Durazo explained that it seems like they do that around Key West by the Sea also. Peter Horton asked that in Section 11 we specifically address the biplane operators and ask them to fly in the most noise sensitive method. Sonny believes that the operators would be more than happy to comply when possible. Peter continues that monitoring their flight paths would be part of the role of the noise compliance officer recommended in Section 11. Peter explained that these are not just strategies that we want to try, but are recommendations of the NCP. Robert Gold believes that the biplane pilots don't know how much noise they produce, or they know and don't care; he believes it is that they know and don't care. He believes that without official policy they will not abide by any requests.

Marlene Durazo asked where would the biplane discussion be placed in the NCP. Deborah Lagos said will put it in as Section 8.4.4, and will be included in Section 11 as a recommended measure. Dan Botto asked what are the biplanes doing. Sonny Knowles said they do air tours, banner towing and aerobatics, but the aerobatics are performed away from the island in a designated area. Dan Botto indicated that the section will be a discussion of air tour and banner towing operations.

Peter Horton indicated that there are multiple pilots that are flying these tours, and the owner is responsible to tell his pilots about the areas to avoid. Peter continued that the airport has been getting complaints about the biplanes for years, so a simple discussion with the operators will not last and there must be an ongoing process. Dan Botto mentioned that as part of the program management measures, better education of the pilots using KWIA regarding noise sensitive areas and noise mitigation methods has been included in the recommendations. Deborah Lagos indicated the NCP will add these particular users to that discussion also.

<u>Helicopter Operations</u>: Dan Botto indicated that there have been complaints regarding helicopters operating to the north of the airport. Because of the ability of the helicopters to fly below areas of US navy activity, the NCP recommends that when conditions permit, helicopters should arrive and depart to the south of the airport. This would be a voluntary recommendation, and obviously would not apply to Coast Guard, Life Flight, and other official and emergency operations. Sonny Knowles felt that was certainly a reasonable request for the helicopter

operators to avoid noise sensitive areas, but there are times when they are photographing particular areas of real estate and may not be able to avoid these areas. Mr. Blazevic mentioned that the visiting helicopters use the easiest route in and out which is from the north. Commissioner Kolhage indicated that some of the flights could be Mosquito Control and are not going to change.

<u>Airport Use Restrictions</u>: Dan explained that these are ways to limit the louder aircraft from using the airport, or times that the airport may be used.

Denial of use to aircraft not meeting Federal noise standards: All of the commercial aircraft currently meet Federal noise standards and as of December 31, 2015 all of the small business jets and privately owned jets will have to meet the Federal noise standards. There are currently no noise standards for small piston aircraft. Use restrictions based on noise levels are not recommended.

Capacity limitation based on relative noisiness: The louder aircraft will be fully phased out within 2 years, and to limit would require a Part 161 study which could cost upwards of a million dollars. Robert Gold asked what will be the effect of the phase out. Sonny Knowles said there are not many of the older business jets flying into Key West. Dan Botto mentioned that while some of the aircraft will be replaced, re-engined, or hush-kitted, many will just be retired as the owners will not be able to afford to meet the new standards.

Marlene Durazo asked about the effect of opening Cuba up to direct flights. Dan Botto said the aircraft will still have to meet the noise standards whereever they come in from. Sonny Knowles said that there has been a reduction in flights due to fuel costs and that can be expected to continue.

Required use of noise abatement takeoff and/or approach procedures: KWIA already uses the voluntary close-in departure procedures, and the NCP will recommend voluntary use of the NBAA close-in arrival procedures and the propeller and power adjustment procedure, when safety permits. This information will be provided to local and visiting pilots.

Landing fees based on noise levels or time of arrival: Any restrictions based on noise levels or landing fees would require a Part 161 analysis, and due to cost is not being recommended for the NCP.

Partial or complete curfews: Currently KWIA has a voluntary curfew between 11 pm and 7 am. The NCP will recommend that this continues and would be included in the education of local and visiting pilots. Peter Horton said that the monitoring of this would be part of the noise coordinator's job.

Deborah Lagos mentioned an article that was provided to the committee regarding two California airports that have tried to implement mandatory curfews for years and have not been successful. Burbank Airport says they have spent millions of dollars over a decade to perform a Part 161 Study to approve a curfew. There is now a congressman trying to get this brought up again for Burbank and Van Nuys. Dr. Floyd mentions that these curfews can interfere with flights that may be family emergencies. These late night flights are not usually somebody wanting to go party in Miami Beach. How would you feel if one of these curfews would impact your family, or affected the safety of the flight?

Land Use Alternatives:

Deborah Lagos began the discussion of the Land Use Alternatives, Section 9 of the NCP. The NCP looks at measures that look at existing impacts and preventative measures. The biggest item of land use measures will be the NIP [Noise Insulation Program], but we want to draw your attention to Section 9.2 with the description of the various type of land uses that are not compatible with the noise level, and the description of why some of those particular places are not being considered for the mitigation program, and why some are included, for example, the condominiums at Ocean Walk and Las Salinas, and the Doubletree Hotel. These facilities were warned before they were constructed that they were in a noise impact area. Peter Horton explained that they receive very few complaints from these areas as they were constructed with the noise in mind. Peter asked if transient lodging [hotels] were considered compatible land use. Deborah explained that they are not compatible, but they are not typically mitigated. Deborah mentioned the specific condominiums, apartments, and hotels that are not being included in the mitigation, all along the eastern end of the airport. Deborah also mentioned that the high school is not included in the mitigation because they were part of the previous Part 150 mitigation.

Robert Padron mentioned that the data for Key West by the Sea may not be accurate; it should be 206 units, not 203, which Dan Botto explained that the information was correct in the tables, but had not been changed in the text. Robert pardon also believed the year built and acreage may be off. Deborah asked if anyone had documentation of this information to please send it along, as her only source was the Monroe County Tax Assessor's website.

Deborah Lagos also mentioned the other areas within the contour that are not compatible, such as Grace Lutheran School and parts of the Catholic Charities property. Ray Blazevic asked if this means they are eligible for some form of noise mitigation. Deborah informed him that yes they will be.

Stewart Andrews said that the building on the back of the Catholic Charities properties are new and should not be included in the NIP. Ray Blazevic also reminded the Committee that these building had previously been a church and now were residences.

Peter Horton asked if there are 346 units to be NIP'ed and Deborah explained that the number might change based on this discussion and other eligibility determinations.

Deborah Lagos directed the Committee to look at Figure 9.1 to see the noise contour with the areas to be included in mitigation identified. Keep in mind that many properties in the mitigation areas have been mitigated previously. Deborah continued describing how the areas were chosen and how the "Block Rounding" was developed.

Stewart Andrews also believes that the townhomes in the Sun Terrace area are new, but Deborah indicates that this area was not in the previous contour so they would still be eligible.

Deborah asked the Committee if they thought there were other areas that should be included o if they thought there were any areas included that should not be included.

Peter Horton asked if all of Key West by the Sea is included in the mitigation. Dan Botto and Deborah discussed altering the mitigation map in the NCP because the areas to be included were not completely clear.

Marlene Durazo asked if the map would be revised before submittal to FAA. Deborah said that it would be revised to show more clearly the areas to be mitigated.

Deborah mentioned that Table 9-1 quantifies all the housing units in the mitigation areas.

Deborah explained that we are not going to go over the land use measures that are not being recommended. Deborah continued that the Land Use Recommendations consist of the Noise Insulation Program, which will be similar to the previous NIP, with the difference of nonparticipants, either by choice or because it is determined that their house does not meet eligibility standards, being offered the purchase of an avigation easement. It is a onetime monetary payment. Kay Miller asked how much the easement would be purchased for. Deborah said they should be in the neighborhood of \$5,000 each. Commissioner Kolhage asked what is the

purpose of the easement and Deborah explained that the easement is for the acknowledgement of the noise and that the homeowner will not seek damages for noise. Commissioner Kolhage asked what is the homeowner supposed to do with the money or is it just compensation for the noise. Deborah explained that it is just compensation.

Dr. Floyd asked if the easement held up or did people come after the airport at a later date anyway. Kay Miller explained that the Avigation Easements stand up pretty well to legal challenges.

Commissioner Kolhage asked if the new FAA guidance will require every unit in Key West by the Sea to be tested. Deborah explained that the guidance is not completely clear on the testing procedures. Currently the methodology seems to be to group the units by construction type, age, number of stories, and any other number of parameters that can be identified. Then we will quantify the number of units in each category and select a minimum of 10 % of each category will be pretested. The mitigation will be designed based on the pretest, and the test homes will be post tested to determine if the mitigation is effective or if it needs to be adjusted to meet noise reduction standards. Deborah continued that there is a down side to this testing, if a house in any category tests as already having the desired outdoor to indoor noise levels, that house and all the others in that category could be denied mitigation. Deborah explained that the FAA has only recently come out with this guidance and the process will probably evolve as the methodology is actually put into practice.

Stewart Andrews asked if there is a certain level of noise reduction that must be met. Deborah Lagos explained that a minimum of 5 dB is required. She continued that if it is already quiet enough inside then the home could be ruled ineligible.

Deborah asked if the Committee was in favor of offering the easement option. Kay Miller felt that if the people did not want to participate in the NIP, they would most likely appreciate the easement. Dr. Floyd suggested that some homeowners would rather not have the easement because then if they sell their house the next owner has no recourse.

Deborah continued that the NCP will offer a NIP with an avigation easement or strictly the purchase of an avigation easement to the eligible home. She also reminded the Committee that we will review the eligibility of the Catholic Charities facilities.

Deborah asked the Committee what is their feeling about including Grace Lutheran School. The consensus was that it was an old facility for the most part and should be included.

Deborah continued with the preventative land use measures. She continued that in the previous Part 150, it was recommended that a couple of parcels be rezoned to prevent noncompatible land uses. These recommendations were not completed by the City. The Airport is currently in negotiations to purchase the parcel at the east end of the runway, but the NCP will recommend the purchase of an avigation easement for the vacant lot on Flagler Avenue.

Deborah mentioned that in the previous NCP, it was recommended that the City add compatible land use zoning regulations, but this did not happen. In this NCP, we are recommending they just modify a paragraph in the existing zoning regulations that will make reference to the Airport noise contours and instead of the wording saying "avoid encroaching on the airport hazard zone" and change to "noncompatible land use proposed within the KWIA DNL 65 dB noise contour is prohibited."

Commissioner Kolhage felt that this would probably not be approved by the BOCC since it is prohibiting use of the land, it is almost a taking of the property. Peter Horton suggests it say "prohibited or must be built in a compatible manner." Deborah said she will reword this using language from the Part 150 regulations.

Deborah explained that the other approved recommendations from the previous NCP that were not implemented are being requested to be rescinded so they are no long on the books.

<u>Program Management Measures</u>:

Deborah mentioned that the NCP will recommend that the Airport hire an airport noise coordinator, who would be responsible for overseeing the NIP, monitor compliance with noise abatement procedures, and the education and notification of the pilot community. Peter Horton said that this does not have to be an airport staff person, since there will be a NIP program, and the Ad Hoc committee will continue, and the annual contour update will continue, this could be an outside consultant, as the FAA may pay for it either way. Deborah explained that this will be reworded to be an either airport staff or outside consultant for this position.

Deborah explained that the NCP recommend that the Ad Hoc Committee be continued through the NIP

She continued that the NCP will recommend that the Airport develop a brochure, Jeppeson insert and other material to assist in the pilot education program regarding noise abatement procedures at KWIA. Stewart Andrews asked if this included the App for electronic access to this information. Deborah explained that this is the Whispertrack® system that the Airport will subscribe to and goes out to all the flight planning services so pilots can get this on their tablets.

The NCP is also recommending informational boards be put into all the accessible pilot's lounges.

Deborah continues that the Airport will install lighted airfield signs to remind the pilots about the noise abatement procedures.

The NCP will also recommend the purchase of a flight tracking and noise monitoring system, which is eligible for FAA funding.

The NCP will recommend the continuation of the annual contour update to keep tabs on the validity of the avigation easement and the boundaries of the noise mitigation program.

Deborah explained that Section 11 is a summary of only the recommendations of the NCP. She asked that the Committee open to page 11-19 showing that the entire NCP mitigation will cost approximately \$25 million; the implementation plan on page 11-20 provides the timeline for the entire mitigation program.

Sonny Knowles asked if current government spending issues are a problem. Peter Horton explained that this comes from a special pot of money from Airport Improvement Program set aside.

Deborah explained that Appendix J lists every single parcel that is in the program area, and Appendix M shows the proposed implementation plan by address. Included in Phase 1 are the 4 homes that did not choose to participate the first time around but now have new owners. If they chose not to participate and still own the property, they are in Phase 8.

The Committee voted to submit the NCP with the changes discussed to the BOCC, Sonny Knowles made the motion and Kay Miller seconded the motion. The "ayes' were unanimous.

The Commissioner adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.